

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,989	05/24/2006	Rami Evron	PHUS030466US2	1420
38107 PHILIPS INTI	7590 11/03/201 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P. O. Box 300	1	SANEI, MONA M		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/03/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/595,989	EVRON, RAMI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MONA M. SANEI	2882	

	MONA M. SANEI	2882					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked: Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office e of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as ven if timely filed,				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment of the final rejection, the content of the proposed amendment of the proposed	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	E below);					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·						
7. \(\bar{\times} \) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: \(\frac{1.20}{1.20} \) and \(\frac{21}{1.20} \). Claim(s) objected to: \(\text{Claim(s)} \) objected to: \(\text{Claim(s)} \) elipides (signal \(\frac{12-19}{1.20} \). Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \(\text{Li} \).		be entered and an e	oplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•					
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Mona M Sanei/ Examiner, Art Unit 2882	/Hoon Song/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2882					

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

By virtue of the amendments to the claims, the claim objections set forth in the Final mailed August 17, 2010, have been overcome.

By virtue of an amendment, claim 12 now recites "the target required noise level". This phrase lacks proper antecedent basis. It is noted that parent claim 8 includes the limitation "a targeted noise level". Claims 13-19 are rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

By virtue of the amendments to the claims, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2 claim rejections of claims 17 and 19 set forth in the Final mailed August 17, 2010, have been overcome.

Applicant's arguments filed October 12, 2010, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that claim 8 requires using body mass index to determine the target radiation dose for a scan and "not after scanning" and that the target radiation dose is determined and selected "before" performing the scan as the x-ray diagnostic examination of the patient is performed (pg. 8). Examiner would like to respectfully point out that these features (see specifically those phrase in quotes) upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim. It is noted that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, imitations from the specification are not read into the claims. It is also noted that method claim 8 does not include claim limitation that would require the steps of the method to be performed in the order in which they are presented. For this reason, applicant's assertion is not persuasive and the rejection is being maintained.